



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE. Vol. XII, Part 1.

This volume opens with an article by Herwerden, pp. 1-23, on L. Mendelssohn's recent edition of Herodian, the historian of the times succeeding the death of Marcus Aurelius. He says: "prodiit Romanae historiae auctor plurimis locis emendatus tam codicum ope quam coniecturis, utilissima addita praefatione et quam fieri potuit locupletissimo subiecto supellectile critico.<sup>1</sup> Eximio libro ab editore donatus legi atque relegi Herodianum, eiusque operae fructum qualemcumque grati simul animi testimonium egregie cordato critico nunc offero." The article, as it stands, bears the marks of this double reading; for the latter part of it, pp. 15-23, consists of "addenda" to the former, containing notes on the same books and chapters, and occasionally giving a maturer view of the same passage; e.g. "i 9, 5, καὶ πάντες ὑπώπτενον μὲν τὰ λεχθέντα, πιστεύειν δὲ οὐ προσεποιούντο. Supra conieci post ὑπώπτενον μὲν excidisse verba ἀληθῆ εἶναι, nunc re iterum considerata nescio an potius leniore manu rescribendum sit πιστεύειν δὲ οὐ(ν) προσεποιούντο hac sententia: *et quamvis omnes suspecta haberent dicta, tamen revera fidem se iis habere simulabant.* Ut enim mox sequitur, τότε καιρὸν εὐκαιρον ἔχοντες (Perennium) διαβάλλειν ἐπειρῶντο. Notissima autem est ea particulae οὐν vis, ut significet fere ὄντως." This may be taken as a sample of all these notes, which contain hardly anything of general interest. On i 11, 1, αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ἀγαλμα δι' ἱππετὲς εἶναι λέγουσιν he writes: "fluvii Graece ad Homeri exemplum audiunt δι' ἱππεῖς, quaecumque vero e coelo cadunt aut cadere creduntur, ut lapides et signa, διοπετῇ, itaque vulgatam scripturam . . . διοπετὲς revocandum esse arbitror . . . frequens est utriusque vocabuli confusio, sed certum discrimen."

Naber next, pp. 24-43, contributes an article on Pindar. He confesses that "Pindarum quisquis studet emendare," after Boeckh and others,<sup>2</sup> runs much risk "ne cum sibilo excipiat et ex stadio facessere iubeatur . . . Nam si quis suo Marte recensere volet omnia Pindari carmina et novam parare editionem, huic opus erit poetam tanquam digitos suos nosse." His purpose is less ambitious. On reading Pindar again, in Bergk's third edition, he found that it offered "observationes et emendationes, quae mihi maxime placuerant, nam veritas incurrerat in oculos; earum magnam partem praeceptam mihi vidi . . . Verum hoc ipsum audentio rem reddidit, ut in medium proferrem selectas suspiciones inter legendum mihi subnatas, quae aut satis certae esse viderentur, aut certe minime incertiores iis, quas hucusque editoribus probatas esse comperi." His first comment is on Ol. i 7, μηδ' . . . αὐδάσσομεν. He will

<sup>1</sup> 'Locupletissimo subiecto supellectile critico.' There is no mistake about the *o* s, and one is forced meekly to remonstrate against the bad proof-reading of the *Mnemosyne* that so often spoils the genial flow and lively polemic of its pages.—B. L. G.

<sup>2</sup> Naber has run a great risk, as it is.—B. L. G.

not admit that the verb may be subjunctive, though Herwerden has endeavored to establish such license for Pindar, and though he grants that Ol. vi 24, *ὄφρα* . . . *βάσομεν* looks that way. Since then *αὐδάσομεν* cannot be subj. and *μηδέ* forbids the future, what else can he do than make the clause precisely parallel to *μηκέτ' ἀέλιον σκόπει*, by reading *αὔδα σύ μοι*? A similar fault he finds, Nem. ix 28, in *ἀναβάλλομαι*, for which "quod reponere volui *ἀναβαλλέμεν*, id Herwerdenus occupavit emendare." On Ol. iii 25 he writes: "Soloecum est quod editur *ὃς τὸτ' ἐς γαῖαν πορεύειν θυμὸς ὤρμαν'* Ἰστρίαν νιν . . . Bergkius recte vidit *πορεύειν* pro? *πορεύεσθαι* stare non posse: quod autem commentus est, ut ei malo mederetur, id divulgare non debent qui docti editoris manes placatos sibi esse cupiunt. Est tamen vera lectio sat facilis inventu. Cf. modo Pyth. x 28: *περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον* et videbis hic quoque reponendum esse *περαίνειν*." On Ol. iii 45: *οὐ μιν διώξω· κεινὸς εἶην*, he says of L. Schmidt's rendering, '*ich werde sie nicht verfolgen: mag ich immer inhaltlos sein*,' that "elegantissime effecit Schmidti ut minus appareret, etiam hoc sensu particulam conditionalem abesse non posse, et periculum est interdum Germanica scribentibus et cogitantibus, quod minus magnum est iis, qui usu Latini sermonis veterum criticorum morem retinuerunt." He thinks also that *μιν* cannot be taken for *αὐτοὺς*, and that *διώξω* may be a future in Pindar, and that therefore Bergk's *οὐ μὴ διώξω* is not necessary. "Sed quid est *κεινὸς εἶην*? Frustra, opinor, erimus, nisi rescripserimus *οὐ μὴν διώξω κεινὸς ἔμμεν*. Unum certe est quod lucrabimur, nam etiam puer sine magistro hanc scripturam poterit intelligere." On Ol. vi 15 (*νεκρῶν τελεσθέντων*), he finds fault with Bergk for mentioning the various conjectures that have been made: "tam mirifica fuit in Bergkio diligentia ut etiam levissimas suspiciones et infelices correctiunculas undecumque conraderet . . . aperte dicam: talia mihi nauseam creant, et nisi contemnere audeas quae tam praepostere excogitata fuerunt, numquam in re critica facies operae pretium. Ille tamen est Bergkius, qui . . . queritur de Cobeti tumultuaria doctrina." Naber himself, comparing Ol. ii 15 (*θέμεν ἔργων τέλος*) proposes *τέλος θέντων*. "Combustis cadaveribus *πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλόξ ἐμαράνθη*." Again, on Ol. vi 86, *ὑδωρ πίομαι* . . . *πλέκων* . . . *ἕμνον* he reproves Bergk for quoting Meineke's conj. *πίνομαι*, and suggests himself *πίνομεν* . . . *πλέκειν*. In Ol. vii 58 he proposes *ἐνριψεν* for *ἐνδειξεν* *λάχος* 'Δελίου. On Ol. ix 83, *σφετέρως ἀτερθε* . . . *δαμασιμβρότον αἰχμᾶς*, it is shown that the assumed use of *σφετέρως* as a poss. pron. of the third person singular rests on a very slender basis of facts, and that there is still less for its use as a general possessive of any person. In the course of this discussion it is suggested that in Py. iv 98 for *πολλὰς γαστρός* we should read *ποτε* *Fās*. On Nem. ix 23, *γλυκὴν νόστον ἐρεισάμενοι*, he writes: "confitetur Bergkius se locum non posse expedire: more tamen suo perscribit omnia virorum doctorum tentamina . . . Sardi venales: alter altero nequior. Quanto melius fuisset, si Bergkius bonae chartae Teubnerianae pepercisset et omisisset ridiculas coniecturas, quae splendidis et utilissimis voluminibus dedecori sunt. Connivere in erroribus eorum qui ante nos fuerunt et ponere in clara luce si quid alii olim recte viderint, haec demum pietas est . . . Commendo: *νόστον ἐπειγόμενοι*, cf. Pyth. iv 34 et ix 73."

We have next, pp. 44-56, emendations of the ninth book of Plato's *Leges*, by the late Dr. Badham. Only one or two specimens of these notes can be quoted: 855b, *ὅπως ἂν τῶν κλήρων ἀργὸς μηδεὶς μηδέποτε γίγνηται δι' ἀπορίαν χρημάτων*.

"Vertit interpres, 'nequis unquam propter indigentiam pecuniarum sua sorte *privetur*.' Hoc probat Astius: 'ἀργὸς *vacuus*, expers.' Verte, nequa sors propter indigentiam *inculta iaceat*. Hac de causa pluries in hoc libro non modo de sorte vendunda cavet, sed videndum esse docet, ὅπως ὁ κληρὸς ἔσται *κατεσκευασμένος παντελῶς*." 864c, "Libri *βυαίων* καὶ *ξυμφώνων*. Veram lectionem repperit Astius *ἐμφανῶν*, cui infra opponitur *μετὰ σκότους*. Palaeographiae peritis facillima videbitur haec correctio. Quid Turicenses? 'ἀξυμφώνων nos: Conf. 863c.' Vix est operae pretium; nam nihil ibi reperies simile, praeterequam quod dixit *μεγάλων καὶ ἀμούσων ἀμαρτημάτων*." 872c, ἐὰν δέ τις δοῦλον κτείνῃ μηδὲν ἀδικούντα, φόβῳ δὲ μὴ μνηστῆς αἰσχυρῶν ἔργων καὶ κακῶν αὐτοῦ γίγνηται, ἢ τινος ἔνεκα ἄλλον τοιοῦτον, καθάπερ ἂν εἰ πολίτην κτείνας ὑπείχετο φόνον δικας, ὡσαύτως καὶ τοῦ τοιοῦτου δούλου κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἀποθανόντος οὕτως ὑπεχέτω. "Qui *δοῦλον* supplevit, ne intellexit quidem *φόνον* post τοῦ τοιοῦτου subintelligi, nec vidit κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ad ὑπεχέτω pertinere, itaque perquam inepte *ἀποθανόντος* inseruit."

C. M. Francken next, pp. 57-78, continues his notes *ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos*. This article is full of interesting matter, but only a few lines can be here extracted. "Proprium huic litteraturae (*capitalem* volo) est, ut E et I vix distinguantur; non operae est dicere, quoties Kellerus qui post Peyronem Taurinensem contulit, dubium se haerere dixit, utra littera scripta esset; res pro se loquitur: obliqui ductus litterae E tam sunt minuti et exiles, ut facile oculorum aciem fugiant, unde sola residua littera primaria quasi stirpe I nascitur. *Intellegere* et *neglegere* scripserunt vulgo veteres: semel in hac oratione [Tulliana] §26 *intelligatis* extare dicitur, de quo dubito propter similitudinem illam. Contra *luci* §47 ex codice pro *luce* recipiendum puto, ubi verba de XII tabulis recitantur: 'ut furem noctu liceat occidere, et *luci*, si se telo defendat. Plauti certe aequales *luci* dixerunt, quem 'locativum adverbiascentem' in antiquiore XII tabularum sermone usurpatum esse consentaneum est. Non puto Ciceronem constanter *luci* dixisse, cum aliis locis in ipso T. sit *luce*, Vergilius habeat 'lucē palam,' sed quod T. in eis quae sequuntur *luce*, hoc autem loco, ubi de XII tabularum verbis agitur, *luci* habet, non potest casu factum esse." In Pison. §81, 'Habet hoc virtus, quam tu ne de facie quidem nosti, ut viros fortes species eius et pulcritudo etiam in hoste posita delectet.' "Non est latinum 'in hoste *posita*' pro ante oculos posita. Nec *exposita*, nec *proposita* aptum est, sed *conspecta* (*specta*)."

Cobet continues, pp. 79-107, his notes on Stein's Herodotus, book IV. There is not much of general interest in this article. Very many of the alterations insisted on have already found their way into other editions, being the readings of Codex R. To take a short example: iv 62, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκατὼν ἀνδρῶν ἀνδρα θύουσι. "Vocabulum necessarium commode suppeditat Codex R: ἀνδρα ἔνα θύουσι. Erat in vetusto libro ΑΝΔΡΑἸ." This reading is given by Abicht and Blakesley. On iv 8, where Hdt. speaks of the scene of one of the labors of Hercules as being in the island of Erytheia τὴν πρὸς Γαδείροις τοῖσι ἐξω Ἡρακλέων στηλῶν ἐπὶ τῷ Ὠκεανῷ, he says he will endeavor by a new argument to confirm his opinion that the so-called writings of Hecataeus are 'suppositos et ψευδεπιγράφους.' A passage is cited from Arrian, *Anab.* ii 16, in which we are assured that Hecataeus asserted that it was not from any part of Spain that

Hercules brought the cattle of Geryon, but that τῆς ἡπείρου περὶ Ἀμβρακίαν τε καὶ Ἀμφιλόχους βασιλεῖα γενέσθαι Γηρυνήνῃν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἡπείρου ταύτης ἀπελάσαι Ἡρακλεῖα τὰς βοῦς. "Nempe si haec Herodotus apud antiquiorem historicum legisset, non omisisset hanc quoque fabulam commemorare etiamsi minus probabiliter iudicasset, ut iii 9: οὗτος μὲν ὁ πιθανώτερος τῶν λόγων εἰρηται. δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἥσσον πιθανόν, ἐπεὶ γε δὴ λέγεται, ῥηθῆναι, et similia his passim scribit etiam in leviori dissensu." Occasionally Stein is commended, iv 122: οἱ Πέρσαι ἐδῶκον πρὸς ἧν τε καὶ τοῦ Ταναΐδος. "Felicissime Stein emendavit: καὶ ἸΘΥ (ἰθὺ) Ταναΐδος. Cf. iv 120: ἰθὺ Ταναΐδος ποταμοῦ. iv 136: ἐδῶκον τοὺς Πέρσας ἰθὺ τοῦ Ἰστροῦ, et sic passim."

The concluding pages of this part are filled with notes by Cobet on the *Varia Historia* of Aelian. xiii 9: Δάμια ἢ Ἀττική ἐταῖρα εἶπεν· οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος λέοντες ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γεγόνασιν ἀλώπεκες., "Fieri potest ut Lamia quoque ita dixerit, sed multis ante Lamiam annis iocosus de Lacedaemoniis vericulus omnibus erat in ore: οἰκοὶ λέοντες, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ δ' ἀλώπεκες. . . Apud Plutarchum in *compar. Lysandri cum Sulla* editur cap. 3: (Lysander) εἰ δὴ τις ἄλλος ἐκπεφευγὼς τοῦτ' ἐπερίακτον, οἰκοὶ λέοντες, ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ δ' ἀλώπεκες. Perspicuum est emendari oportere: τοῦτ' ἐπεριΒΟΗτον· οἰκοὶ λέοντες, ἐν ΕΦΕΣΩΙ δ' ἀλώπεκες." xiii 23: Λυκοῦργος . . . οὐ καλὸς τοὺς μισθὸς ἡρύσατο. "Nihil est ἀρνεσθαι μισθόν, *mercedem laurire*. Suspisor fuisse ἡ Νύσατο, ut in Pluto: κὰν ταῦτ' ἀνύσται τετταράκοντα βούλεται. Graeci veteres constanter dicebant τὸν μισθὸν λαβεῖν, sed Aelianus τὰ κατημαξευμένα vitat, et ἀσυνήθη venatur." "Multa sunt apud Aelianum portentose corrupta sine ulla spe emendationis. Quale est quod legitur xiii 25 *Pindarus a Corinna victus* σὺν ἐκάλει (libri συνεκάλει) τὴν Κόρινναν. Quis haec sana esse credet? Cur Pindarus aemulam *suam appellabat*? ἐλέγχων τὴν ἀμουσίαν τῶν ἀκρατῶν,<sup>1</sup> inquit. Igitur illos ipsos increpare debebat, non Corinnae maledicere. Eiusdemmodi vitium obscurat locum xiii 26: ἡθῦμαι ὁ Διογένης καὶ φύλλων ἄκρα ἥσθην. Bona fide vertunt: *et summas foliorum extremitates manducabat*. Vellem huiusmodi interpretibus tales dapes apponi. Sed quis haec emendabit?" xiii 28: "Aelianus sibi perfacetus esse videtur et si quid lepide se putat dixisse suum ἵνα τι καὶ παῖσιν addere solet. H. l. usus est ioco sed tam frigido quam obscuro, ut nemo quid diceret adhuc intelligere potuerit. *Diogenis servus* οὐ φέρων τὴν μετ' αὐτοῦ διατριβὴν ἀπέδρα, tum post pauca: οὗτος δὲ ὁ οἰκέτης εἰς Δελφοὺς ἀλῶμενος ὑπὸ κύνων διεσπάσθη, perspicua haec sunt sed continuo addit:

<sup>1</sup> As if the ἀμουσία τῶν ἀκρατῶν were not shown by the bestowal of the prize on a ὕς! Korinna was a ὕς, a Βοιωτία ὕς—as we should say a 'Wolverine,' a 'Sucker,' a 'Hoosier,' and spoke the language of the Σύες or Ὑάντες to the Ὑάντες. To the familiar charm of this Hyantian dialect she owed in part her success; acc. to Pausanias, 9, 22, 3: φαίνεται δέ μοι νικήσαι τῆς διαλέκτου τε ἕνεκα ὅτι ἦδεν οὐ τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Δωριδί, ὥσπερ ὁ Πίνδαρος, ἀλλὰ ὅποια συνήσειν ἐμελλόν Διολεῖς κτέ. The Greeks were wretched punsters, thanks to the phonetic perfection of their language, and this miserable little joke has given modern scholars more trouble than Aelian is worth. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff discredits the story, which very few credit, in his own peculiar way—Homerische Untersuchungen, p. 321: Die dumme fabel von ihrem [K.'s] verkehrte und ihrer concurrenz beruht einmal auf dem gedichte an Myrtis, zum andern auf Pindars bekannten versen auf die ὕες Βοιωτῶν [cf. fr. IV 9] d. h. den zum spotte gewandten Hyantennamen. Dumm nenne ich die Fabel, nicht weil Pindar keine dame schwein hätte nennen mögen; ich bezweifle, ob er sehr galant war; wol aber weil sie einen agon einmischte, also etwas specifisch attisches. Pindars poesie zeigt, dass seine gesellschaft diese demokratische institution nicht kannte (?)—B. L. G.

τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ δεσπότης δίκας ἐκτίσας ἀνθ' ὧν ἀπέδρα. Multum se torquet Perizonius neque proficit hilum. Diogenes κῶων appellabatur, et sic dicitur servus infidelis discerptus a *canibus* poenas *Canis* dedisse . . . Dabo simillimum iocum ex Diogene Laertio vi 51: Diogenes ἀκούσας ποτὲ ὅτι Διδύμων ὁ μοιχὸς συνελήφθη, “Ἄξιος, ἔφη, ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος κρέμασθαι,” et ex Demetrio περὶ Ἑρμηνείας §186: Ἀλέξανδρον βουλευομένου δρόμον ἀγωνίσασθαι Ὀλυμπίαις ἔφη τις οὕτως, “Ἀλέξανδρε, δράμε σου τῆς μητρὸς τὸ ὄνομα” . . . Compares etiam Herodotum vii 180: τῷ δὲ σφαγιασθέντι τούτῳ οὐνομα ἦν Λέων· τάχα δ' ἂν τι καὶ τοῦ οὐνόματος ἐπαύροιο,” xiii 31: ἀφῆκε τὸν ὄρνιν ἐπειπὼν ὅτι μὴ ἐξέδωκε τὸν ἱκέτην. “Possuntne vitiosius quam sic οὐ ἐτ' μὴ inter se confundi?”

C. D. MORRIS.

#### HERMES. 1884. I.

Mommsen, Die Conscriptionsordnung der Römischen Kaiserzeit. There are four distinct components of the standing army: *legiones*, *auxilia*, *alae*, *classarii*. To these we may add the *praetoriani* or bodyguard. The *auxilia* of the imperial era fairly correspond to the *socii* of the republic. The conscription, however, was very unequal. Where the population was particularly well suited for military service, as *e. g.* in the country of the Batavi, the levies were very heavy, but they were correspondingly light in a district of an opposite character, *e. g.* Egypt. In the Augustan age Italy furnished legionaries, but Vespasian confined the service of the Itali to drafting them for the praetorian guard. The legionaries when drafted, as a rule, are either *cives* or attain that rank through their service. This practice really began in the great struggles preceding the end of the republic, and Augustus found himself unable to suspend or materially modify it. While free birth (*natum esse ex ingenuo*) was a requisite, many *libertini* were ranged in the legions by privilege. Hadrian seems to have been the author of local conscription. Of course some provinces, as Upper and Lower Germania, did not provide enough material for the standing armies required for their maintenance. While, formally, there were no legions of the first and second rank, the oriental legions, as a matter of fact, were of poorer stuff than the occidental. The soldiers of the *auxilia* generally are quoted as being from a tribe, nationality, or clan rather than from a municipality, *domo* or *civis* being added to the simple ethnical nominative or ablative. The *classarii*, as a rule, appear as the direct personal servants of the emperor, their social caste being lower than that of other branches of the service. Septimius Severus, the *princeps* of the purely military emperors, went one step beyond Vespasian: he excluded the Italians even from service in the praetorian guard, the bulk of it being henceforth levied from Illyria, Africa, Syria. It is well known<sup>1</sup> that Augustus, in organizing the empire in the years after Actium, divided the provinces into imperial and senatorial provinces. As a rule no *auxilia* at all were levied in the senatorial provinces, while on the other hand these furnished a relatively full body of legionaries. As regards the political

<sup>1</sup> In 27 B. C., Dio Cassius, 52, 12. Imperial provinces: Hispania Tarraconensis, Lusitania, the several provinces of Gaul, of “Germany,” Coele Syria, Phoenicia, Cilicia, Egypt. Senatorial: Africa, Numidia, Achaia with Epirus, Dalmatia, Macedon, Sicily, Crete with Cyrenaica, Bithynia, Pontus, Sardinia, Hispania, Baetica. Later on Narbonensis and Cyprus were committed to the senate, while Dalmatia was transferred to the imperial list,—E. G. S.

status of the soldiery, Mommsen (pp. 62 sqq.) endeavors to show: (1) That the community from which a praetorian or legionary was drafted may have been either one of Roman citizenship or of the Latin (=Peregrine) order of political condition; (2) that it must, however, have been a municipality; and (3) that every district from which *auxilia* were drafted enjoyed the *Ius Latinum* or *Peregrinum*; (4) that the native place of every soldier serving in a Latin or Peregrine corps possessed *Ius Latinum* or *Peregrinum*.

Th. Thalheim (Die Antidosis) replies to the article on the same subject by M. Fränkel published in *Hermes*, 1883, III, and reported in this *Journal* (v. p. 389). Thalheim insists, and in our judgment successfully maintains, that however absurd the whole device of Antidosis may appear to us, actual exchange of property was provided for. Thalheim's explanation of *Lys.* 24, 9, and of *Dem.* 21, 79, appears to be sound.

E. Maass, of Berlin, prints what are practically prolegomena to a proposed edition of Aratus: "De Phaenomenis Arati recensendis," giving a history of the literary tradition of this author's work. The characteristic taste of the Romans is once more evinced by the fact that not less than three Latin translations of Aratus were prepared, viz., by Cicero, by Germanicus (nephew of Tiberius), and in the fourth century A. D. by Avienus. Maass considers as the best MS the Marcianus 476, of Venice, written in the latter part of the eleventh century A. D. As next in rank he esteems the Vaticanus 1307. "Praeter eos quos dixi Arati codices (p. 95) undetriginta inde ab saeculo tertio decimo usque ad quintum decimum exarati feruntur ex quibus viginti sex aut contuli integros aut quantum satis videretur examinavi."

De Boor, "Zu den Excerptensammlungen des Constantin Porphyrogenetus." This emperor (10 century A. D.) caused to be prepared a collection of extracts from historical writers. Besides these there are met with certain brief notices or abstracts which seem to have served as directions for the copyist. Of these abstracts some seem to have drifted from their proper place. De Boor's discussion is in part directed against Nissen.

B. Keil, *Bemerkungen zur Reconstruction des Philonischen Skeuothek*. Another contribution to the literature of this inexhaustible theme. For the inscription see *A. J. P.* III, p. 317.

## II.

K. I. Neumann, *Die Fahrt des Patrokles auf dem Kaspischen Meer und der alte Lauf des Oxus*. Herodotus was the first ancient author to assert that the Caspian was a separate basin; still he confounded the Armenian stream Araxes with the Oxus river. Later, however, Patrocles, a general of Seleucus, circumnavigated the Caspian. Eratosthenes derived data from him, and in turn furnished material for statements on this subject by Pliny and Strabo. The enumeration of distances (*σταδιασμός*) is of course due to Patrocles, whose work was done in the earlier part of the third century B. C. Neumann proves that Patrocles did *not* make out the Balkan bay as the point where the Oxus in its ancient course entered the Caspian, but mistook for the mouth of the Oxus the narrow straits connecting the bay of Karabughaz with the main body of the Caspian. Patrocles, moreover, believed that the Iaxartes river

(which, in fact, always did flow into lake Aral) flowed into the Caspian likewise ; he put down the mouth of the Iaxartes about 2400 stadia north of that of the Oxus, being misled by the average distance between the Oxus and Iaxartes in their upper course. It is evident, Neumann infers, that Patrocles did not reach any point 2400 stadia to the north of Karabughaz bay, else he would have seen for himself that no river flowed into the Caspian there. It is worth while to recall with Neumann some of the curious results which Alexander's exploits had upon the geographical views of that age. Aristotle had still maintained the existence of the Caspian as a definite and separate basin. But Alexander, through the expedition of Nearchus down the Indus river into the Persian gulf, had realized that the *mare Erythraeum* was a portion of the open ocean : hence was suggested the hypothesis that the Caspian too was merely a gulf of the ocean. The voyage of Patrocles was made before 281 B. C.

Seeck, Die Inschrift des Caecionius Rufus Albinus. This inscription is preserved in a codex of Einsiedeln in a very fragmentary condition. In it the Senate of Rome decrees a statue to Caecionius because Constantine at the instance of Caecionius had restored to the senate certain powers, but it is not evident from the fragment what the powers were. Seeck now argues that it was the privilege of nominating praetors and quaestors, and makes it very probable that the right referred to could not have been the nomination of consuls.

Wissowa (Breslau) describes and explains the MSS containing the abstracts of the Epic Cycle contained in the Cod. Venetus A of the Iliad. Incidentally (p. 206) the statement is made that the Iliupersis of Lesches was no separate work, but merely a portion of the Ilias Minor of that writer.

Mommsen continues his paper on " Die Conscriptionsordnung der Römischen Kaiserzeit," discussing (§V) the stations and headquarters of the *auxilia* in relation to their home. It seems to have been the general plan of the administration down to Vespasian's time to station the *auxilia* in the province in which they were levied. Mutiny and insurrections, however, caused removals and exchanges in particular instances, *e. g.* on the lower Rhine after the revolt of Civilis. Vespasian stationed the German *auxilia* elsewhere after the suppression of that great revolt. The Britain *auxilia* were *never* stationed in Britain. The Pannonian *auxilia* were removed from that province after the great revolt in the declining years of Augustus. The garrisons of Judaea were principally of native conscription, which was not the least cause of the disastrous Jewish revolt of 70 A. D. In 86 A. D. the troops in Judaea are found to be Thracians, Lusitanians, Cantabri, Gaetuli. The *Numeri* were extra bodies and detachments, not ranged in legion, ala or cohort, their size being quite uneven (300-900). *Nationes* is a kindred term. *Cuneus* was the name given to special bodies of cavalry in the latter part of the imperial era.

A. Haebler (Leipzig) argues against B. Niese that Strabo did *not* write his geography at Rome ; at least he proves that Strabo's use of *ἐνθάδε* (VII, c. 290), and *δεῦρο* (XIII, c. 609) when speaking of Rome is not conclusive. He calls attention to the looseness of Strabo in handling these adverbs elsewhere ; and it would seem indeed that Strabo uses them freely, not of the location of the



speaking first person, but as determinatives referring to the locality last mentioned.

Kaibel, *Sententiarum Liber Tertius*, a series of critical notes on Pindar (Pyth. 12, 12 sqq.; Olymp. 2, 75), Homer (Hymn. Apoll. Del. 83 sqq.); here we meet the set form of an oath which Kaibel declares to be interpolated from Il. O 36. Further notes are made on passages in Aeschylus' Prometheus, Sophocles' Electra, Euripides' Medea, a few fragments in Athenaeus, etc.

Maass reports on the Codex Lipsiensis of the scholia to the Iliad, finding that it is entirely without value of its own, and that in the catalogue of ships it is simply a copy from the famous Venetus. Maass conjectures that the MS was prepared in one of the monasteries on Mt. Athos. The date of the MS is the fifteenth century.

U. Wilcken, "Aus Griechischen Papyrus-Urkunden," discusses customs of writing figures and transcribing accounts, dates and values.

Robert, "Der Bildhauer Polycles und seine Sippe." These artists lived in the third and second centuries before Christ. Incidentally R. treats it as settled that Pausanias in his Attica followed Polemon, the author of an Attilis.

E. G. SIHLER.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Erster Jahrgang. Heft 4.

The first article, "De linguae Latinae verbis inchoativis," by Karl Sittl, occupies pp. 465-533. The fate of inchoative forms in the Romance languages is touched upon, and it is shown that the French and Spanish have largely added to their number. In Latin the discussion begins with verbs like *glisco*, *gnosco*, *vescor*, etc., of which no simpler form is found. In *paciscor* it is claimed that the *i* was added to prevent confusion with *pacor*. In some verbs the *sc* had become so closely attached to the root that it passed into derivatives, as *e. g. pasc-uus* and *pas(c)-tus*. So *posco* = *po(rc)-sco* forms for its perfect not *poporci* but *poposci*. In inchoatives, however, where a vowel is interposed, the root being more readily discerned, such formations do not occur. Inchoatives from verbs of the fourth conjugation are treated next, and are shown to be very ancient and to have wholly lost their inceptive force. Of *eriscor* no primitive is found. *Nanciscor* may belong to this class, although *nancio* cited by Priscian from C. Gracchus may have been a verb like *facio*. Inchoatives from verbs of the second conjugation are extremely numerous, and groups are given under the head of the several prepositions with which they enter into composition, *con-*, *de-*, *ex-*, *in-*, *ob-*, *per-*, *re-*, *dis-*. There are very few compounded with *ab-* or *ad-*, and only comparatively late writers use inceptives beginning with *inter-*, *prae-*, and *super-*. There are some few examples of a double preposition, as *coadolesco*, *perextimesco*. Inchoatives of this sort with no preposition entering into composition, like *calesco*, *aresco*, are in the early period comparatively rare, but afterwards increase. In the third century and later a good many such are formed, as *caresco*, *dolesco*, *floresco*. Inceptives which seem to be formed directly from adjectives, like *celebresco*, occur before Cicero only in the tragic poets and Sisenna. Afterwards they are

common enough. Inceptives formed from substantives are probably due to some false analogy. Such are *noctesco*, *auresco*, *silvesco*, but from the first century A. D. their number increases, cf. *radicesco*, *gemmesco*, etc. From the third conjugation, only compounds make inceptives in the early period, as *resipisco*, *proficiscor*, but Lucretius and subsequent writers form inchoatives from simple verbs, e. g. *vivisco*. Inchoatives in *-asco* found in early poets, like *amasco*, *hiasco*, *labasco*, are next discussed. In later writers many of these show forms in *-esco*, while the termination *-asco* is appropriated for verbs derived from substantives, as *roborasco*; and even here the form in *-esco* occasionally crept in, as e. g. *vesperescit*. As to the signification, in many verbs where the simple is lost, the termination cannot be perceived to have any effect on the meaning, and the forms *escit* and *escunt*, as they occur in the Laws of the Twelve Tables, seem after all to be simply fuller and more impressive forms of the substantive verb. Often in prose an inceptive is chosen for its greater length, to give balance to clauses, cf. Cic. Tusc. 4, 37, *nec tabescat molestiis nec frangatur dolore*; and the best writers seem to make no attempt to distinguish carefully between simple and inchoative verbs. When Caesar says, "*Cum maturescere frumenta inciperent*," there is a pleonasm in his words, if the formative suffix has its full meaning. Sittl, in fact, contends that the truly inchoative force is only seen in verbs uncompounded with a preposition, derived from verbs of the second conjugation.

The second part of the discussion treats of inchoative verbs which govern an accusative. It is maintained that the suffix originally indicated the beginning of a passive state, and not of action, and that consequently such verbs ought to be intransitive. They come, however, after the analogy of other verbs, to take the accusative. So Calvus said "*perpetuos requiescere cursus*," and Vergil imitated him in Ec. VIII 4. Interesting examples of *suesco* and its compounds with the accusative are given, of *obliviscor*, and *vescor*, fluctuating between the accusative and ablative. As *horreo*, *paveo*, *tremo*, and *gemo* were not followed by the accusative before the age of Cicero, their inceptives were not so used. Subsequently *horresco*, *expavesco*, *ingemisco*, *contremisco* take the accusative not infrequently. With *erubesco* the accusative became a favorite construction.

The third part of the paper is given to the settlement of the question when and how inceptives came to have a causative value. *Suesco* and its compounds seem to be the first verbs thus used,—passages are cited from Titinius, Varro, Lucretius, Horace, Columella, Tacitus, Florus, and other writers,—but down to the beginning of the fourth century no other inceptives become causative. The sixth century shows a great many inceptives thus used, especially in African Latin. The article closes with an examination of some inceptives found in glossaries, and with an alphabetical index of all the inchoatives discussed. Some idea of the fulness of treatment, of which we have only been able to give a faint outline, may be had from the fact that this list contains upwards of 600 verbs.

Rudolf Schöll proves conclusively that *ampla* in the sense of *ansa*, which heretofore had only been established for writers of the second half of the fourth century, must be read in Cicero in Verr. II 25, 60, "*Iste amplam calumniæ nactus*." It cannot of course be derived from *ansa*, and Schöll connects it with the root *am*, seen in ἀμη, ἀμῖς, etc., the *p* being purely phonetic, as in *exemplum*.

Gröber, pp. 539-557. continues his list of "Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter" from *caccabus* to *cürbus*. It is interesting to observe that evidence from the Romance languages confirms the orthography *caecus*, *caenum*, *caelum*, *cepa* (not *caepa*). In many words, too, light is thrown upon the quantity of vowels coming before two consonants. Max Bonnet, p. 557, admits the existence of an infinitive *totondi*—found in the Passio S. Joannis evangelistae ante portam Latinam, "*iussit eum expoliari et flagellari crinesque capitis totondi*." The spelling *forsitam* is shown to have been very common in later antiquity and the beginning of the middle ages. Georg Goetz examines the evidence of Latin glossaries on the words *abactor*, *abigens*, *abacus*, *abaddir*, and shows in an interesting way how several apparently quite distinct glosses must often be treated as one gloss, while very little independent weight attaches to the glosses of Osbern and Papias. *Anxia*, which Gröber, on p. 242, had shown to be the basis of Ital., Span., Port. *ansia*, O. French *ainse*, *aisse*, is defended as subst. in Orest. Trag. 559, where the editors change to *angor* or *angina*. A second specimen of the Thesaurus prepared by Hauler is given, pp. 564-571, including only the words *aaha*, *abalienatio* and *abalienare*. Wölfflin adds some ten pages of Addenda and Corrigenda to the first volume of the Archiv, and Karl Sittl in a note establishes the reading *stomida* for *tumicla* in Apuleius, Met. 8, 25. *Stomis* occurs in Lucilius, Sat. 15, 17, and in both passages the explanation offered by Nonius applies, namely, "*ferrum quod ad cohibendam equorum tenaciam naribus vel morsui imponitur ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος*."

In the 'Miscellen' Jordan gives some valuable lexical notes to Cato, pointing out some new words, and others the first use of which has hitherto been credited to Varro, Cicero, Livy, Vergil, Horace, Seneca, Petronius, or Pliny. He rightly claims that often it is of importance to know how early a word was employed in a language. J. Piechotta shows that *monubilis* with the force of monolith is to be identified with *μονόβολος*; and that *turunda* is probably an odd case of metathesis for *rutunda*, like *lapidicina* for *lapicidina*. Other notes discuss *soracum* = Gr. *σώρακος*; *seimitus* = *dimidius* in an African inscription recently discovered; *besta* as a vulgar form for *bestia*; the use of *ferae* and *pecudes*; the derivation of *malva*, *maltha*, *malvatus*, and their connection with French *mauvais*; *ἐνοστρος* in the sense of purple (Nonius, 133, 12, in a fragment of Atta); *strambus*, vulgar form for *strabus*; and *admissum*, a neuter substantive for *admissura*. pp. 594-607 are given up to reviews.

M. WARREN.